1	Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)	Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)
2	karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com BARTLIT BECK LLP	paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
	1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200	LLP
3	Denver, Colorado 80202	Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor
	Telephone: (303) 592-3100	San Francisco, CA 94111
4		Telephone: (415) 591-7500
ا ہے	Hae Sung Nam (pro hac vice)	
5	hnam@kaplanfox.com	Christine A. Varney (pro hac vice)
6	KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 850 Third Avenue	cvarney@cravath.com CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
١	New York, NY 10022	825 Eighth Avenue
7	Telephone.: (212) 687-1980	New York, New York 10019
	1 /	Telephone: (212) 474-1000
8	Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In	-
	re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation	Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in Epic
9		Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.
10	Steve W. Berman (<i>pro hac vice</i>) steve@hbsslaw.com	Prondon D. Glockin (SPN 100642)
10	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO	Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643) bglackin@agutah.gov
11	LLP	OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY
	1301 Second Ave., Suite 2000	GENERAL
12	Seattle, WA 98101	160 E 300 S, 5th Floor
	Telephone: (206) 623-7292	PO Box 140872
13	Farmer D. Waller (1)	Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872
14	Eamon P. Kelly (<i>pro hac vice</i>) ekelly@sperling-law.com	Telephone: (801) 366-0260
14	SPERLING & SLATER P.C.	Counsel for Utah
15	55 W. Monroe, Suite 3200	eemiserje: etan
	Chicago, IL 60603	Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)
16	Telephone: (312) 641-3200	glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
17	College Comment for the Down and Class in In-	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
17	Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation	350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071
18	and Attorneys for LittleHoots, LLC and Pure	Telephone: (213) 683-9100
	Sweat Basketball, Inc.	1010p.11010 (210) 000 9100
19		Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)
20	Bonny E. Sweeney (SBN 176174)	brian.rocca@morganlewis.com
20	bsweeney@hausfeld.com	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
21	HAUSFELD LLP 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200	One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
	San Francisco, CA 94104	Telephone: (415) 442-1000
22	Telephone: (415) 633-1908	r (', ', ', ', ', ', ', ', ', ', ', ', ',
	_	Daniel M. Petrocelli, Bar No. 97802
23	Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In	dpetrocelli@omm.com
24	re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and Attorneys for Scalisco LLC d/b/a Rescue	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Fl.
4+	Pets and Peekya App Services, Inc.	Los Angeles, CA 90067-6035
25	1 cis and 1 conjuripp services, inc.	Telephone: (310) 553-6700
	[Additional counsel appear on signature page]	1
26		Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.
27		
	•	

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 4 5 IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD 6 ANTITRUST LITIGATION 7 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT 8 Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case **STATEMENT** No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD 9 In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Date: March 17, 2022 10 Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD Time: 11:00 a.m. Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor (by remote access) Hon. James Donato 11 *In re Google Play Developer Antitrust* Judge: Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD 12 State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case 13 No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD 14 Pursuant to the Court's Amended MDL Scheduling Order ("Scheduling Order") (Dkt. No. 15 16 191, 3:21-md-02981-JD ("MDL")) dated February 2, 2022, setting a status conference on March 17 17, 2022 at 11:00 a.m., the parties in the above-captioned MDL (the "Parties"), by and through 18 their undersigned counsel, submit this Joint Case Management Statement. 19 I. CASE STATUS SUMMARY 20 A. Case Schedule 21 On February 2, 2022, the Court entered the Scheduling Order (MDL Dkt. No. 191) setting 22 23 an April 3, 2023 trial date and interim pretrial deadlines in the MDL. 24 The Parties respectfully seek leave of Court to modify certain interim deadlines in the 25 Scheduling Order, as described below, without impacting any Court hearing or filing deadline. 26 First, the Scheduling Order currently provides Plaintiffs' merits experts with three weeks 27 to serve rebuttal reports to Defendants' ("Google's") merits expert reports. Plaintiffs believe their 28

merits experts may need more than three weeks to fully consider and respond to Google's merits expert reports. The proposed changes would provide Plaintiffs' merits experts with one additional week to serve rebuttal reports (i.e., four weeks, instead of three weeks).

Second, the Scheduling Order currently provides the Parties with two weeks after Plaintiffs' merits experts serve their rebuttal reports to complete expert depositions. The Parties and their experts may need more time to fully consider the opposing Parties' expert reports and prepare for depositions. The proposed changes would provide the Parties with one additional week after rebuttal reports are served to complete expert discovery (i.e., three weeks, instead of two weeks).¹

Finally, the proposal would move the close of fact discovery forward by four days to accommodate the changes described above, while also ensuring Plaintiffs' merits experts can incorporate any discovery obtained near the end of fact discovery into their opening merits reports.

The Parties have met and conferred and agreed to jointly request the changes to the Scheduling Order set forth below.

Event	Current Deadline (Dkt. No. 191)	Proposed Deadline
Class certification hearing	August 4, 2022	August 4, 2022
Fact Discovery Cut-Off	August 12, 2022	August 8, 2022
Plaintiffs' Merits Expert Reports	August 22, 2022	August 15, 2022
Google's Merits Expert Reports	September 26, 2022	September 19, 2022
Plaintiffs' Merits Expert Rebuttal Reports	October 17, 2022	October 17, 2022

¹ The Parties' requested changes to the schedule are consistent with the initial MDL Scheduling Order that the Court entered on October 22, 2021 (Dkt. No. 122) with respect to the allotted time for exchange of expert reports and completion of expert depositions, in that the initial MDL Scheduling Order provided Plaintiffs' merits experts with four weeks to serve rebuttal reports to Google's merits expert reports, and provided the Parties with three weeks after rebuttal reports were served to complete expert depositions.

1
2
3
4
5

Event	Current Deadline (Dkt. No. 191)	Proposed Deadline
Merits Experts Discovery Cut-Off	October 31, 2022	November 7, 2022 ²
Last day to file dispositive and <i>Daubert</i> Motions	November 10, 2022	November 10, 2022

B. Class Certification

With respect to class certification, Consumer Plaintiffs and Developer Plaintiffs (collectively, "Class Plaintiffs") and Google are proceeding in accordance with the Court's Amended MDL Scheduling Order (MDL Dkt. No 191). Class Plaintiffs served their expert reports on February 28. Google's opposition class expert reports are due March 31, with Class Plaintiffs' rebuttal reports due on April 25. Class Plaintiffs and Google are discussing the timing and sequence of expert depositions during the class expert discovery period, which closes on May 13.

II. STATUS OF DISCOVERY

A. Depositions

The Parties have begun taking depositions of Consumer Plaintiffs and witnesses from Google and Epic, including Rule 30(b)(6) testimony from Google and Epic. The Plaintiffs have continued to coordinate on the requested deponents and timing of the depositions. Depositions of Consumer Plaintiffs are largely completed. Depositions of Developer Plaintiffs are scheduled to begin on March 11. Depositions of Plaintiff States have not yet commenced, but are expected to proceed after additional document production is completed.

² The Parties' proposed changes to the schedule would provide three days between the Merits Experts Discovery Cut-Off on November 7, 2022, and the deadline for dispositive and *Daubert* motions on November 10, 2022. Accordingly, the Parties have agreed to make their merits experts available for depositions on or before October 31, 2022, if requested by any opposing Party on the grounds that such deposition is relevant to a dispositive or *Daubert* motion. The Parties intend to use the final week of expert discovery to take the depositions of Google's and Plaintiffs' remaining experts.

B. Written and Document Discovery 1 2 The Parties continue to serve and respond to additional written discovery, and continue to 3 produce documents in response to document requests. Google has informed the Plaintiffs that its 4 production of documents in response to all outstanding requests (for which Google has agreed to 5 produce documents) is nearly complete and should be fully complete by March 17, 2022. The 6 Parties continue to meet and confer over certain document requests. 7 Google and Plaintiff States are still negotiating the scope of documents that 8 Plaintiff States will produce in this case. Plaintiff States have informed Google that they intend to 9 substantially complete production of documents responsive to Google's first set of RFPs by the 10 end of March 2022. 11 12 Dated: March 10, 2022 CRAVATH. SWAINE & MOORE LLP 13 Christine Varney (pro hac vice) Katherine B. Forrest (pro hac vice) 14 Gary A. Bornstein (pro hac vice) Timothy G. Cameron (pro hac vice) 15 Yonatan Even (pro hac vice) Lauren A. Moskowitz (pro hac vice) 16 Justin C. Clarke (pro hac vice) M. Brent Byars (pro hac vice) 17 FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 18 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199) 19 Respectfully submitted, 20 By: <u>/s/ Yonatan Even</u> 21 Yonatan Even 22 Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. 23 24 25 26 27 28

1	Dated: March 10, 2022	BARTLIT BECK LLP
2	Buted. Whiteh 10, 2022	Karma M. Giulianelli
3		KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP Hae Sung Nam
4		Respectfully submitted,
5		By: <u>/s/ Karma M. Giulianelli</u>
6		Karma M. Giulianelli
7		Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in
8		In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation
9		
10	Dated: March 10, 2022	PRITZKER LEVINE LLP Elizabeth C. Pritzker
11		Respectfully submitted,
12		By: _/s/ Elizabeth C. Pritzker
13		Elizabeth C. Pritzker
14		Liaison Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
15		Litigation
16	Dated: March 10, 2022	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
17	Dated. Water 10, 2022	Steve W. Berman
18		Robert F. Lopez Benjamin J. Siegel
19		SPERLING & SLATER PC
		Joseph M. Vanek Eamon P. Kelly
20		Alberto Rodriguez
21		Respectfully submitted,
22		By: <u>/s/ Steve W. Berman</u> Steve W. Berman
23		
24		Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the Developer Class and Attorneys for
25		Plaintiffs LittleHoots, LLC and Pure Sweat Basketball
26		
27		
28		
		-6-

1	Dated: March 10, 2022	HAUSFELD LLP
2	,	Bonny E. Sweeney Melinda R. Coolidge
3		Katie R. Beran Scott A. Martin
4		Irving Scher
5		Respectfully submitted,
6		By: <u>/s/ Bonny E. Sweeney</u> Bonny E. Sweeney
7		Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the
8		Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiffs Scalisco LLC d/b/a Rescue Pets
9		and Peekya App Services, Inc.
10	D . 1 M . 1 10 2022	
11	Dated: March 10, 2022	OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL
12		Brendan P. Glackin
13		Respectfully submitted,
14		By: <u>/s/ Brendan P. Glackin</u> Brendan P. Glackin
15		Counsel for Utah
16		
17	Dated: March 10, 2022	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP Brian C. Rocca
18		Sujal J. Shah Michelle Park Chiu
19		Minna L. Naranjo Rishi P. Satia
20		Respectfully submitted,
21		Bv: <u>/s/ Brian C. Rocca</u>
22		Brian C. Rocca
23		Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		-7-

1	Dated: March 10, 2022	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
2		Daniel M. Petrocelli Ian Simmons
3		Benjamin G. Bradshaw Stephen J. McIntyre
4		Respectfully submitted,
5		By: <u>/s/ Ian Simmons</u>
6		Ian Simmons
7		Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.
8		
9	Dated: March 10, 2022	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP Glenn D. Pomerantz
10		Kyle W. Mach Kuruvilla Olasa
11		Justin P. Raphael Emily C. Curran-Huberty
12		Jonathan I. Kravis Dane P. Shikman
13		Nicholas R. Sidney
14		Respectfully submitted,
15		By: <u>/s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz</u> Glenn D. Pomerantz
16		
17		Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		0
	10	-8- DINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

1	E-FILING ATTESTATION
2	I, Kuruvilla Olasa, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file
3	this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the
4	signatories identified above has concurred in this filing.
5	
6	<u>/s/ Kuruvilla Olasa</u> Kuruvilla Olasa
7	Kuruvilia Olasa
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	_9_